

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/537,118	Applicant(s) DUGGER, HARRY	
	Examiner Mina Haghighatian	Art Unit 1619	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Mina Haghighatian. (3) ____.
- (2) Mr. Omri Behr. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 28 December 2001.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 19.

Identification of prior art discussed: None.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant was informed that the supplementary action previously suggested by Ms. Dudash, will not be mailed, because the priority issue was resolved. Applicant was given suggestions to make claim 1 more clear and to amend claim 19. Applicant was informed that specification, page 11, example 1-B was missing information in rows 1 and 2. Pages 10-11 of the specification were not filled with the PCT case and there was no way to compare the missing information between US and PCT case. Applicant will file response and amendments..